## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

V.

ORDER ON REMAND

Vladimir Vladimirovic Brik,

Defendant.

Craig R. Baune, Jordan L. Sing, and Katharine T. Buzicky, Office of the United States Attorney, 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 600, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415, for Plaintiff United States of America

Vladimir Vladimirovic Brik, BOP Register No. 18466-041, FCI-Elkton, P.O. Box 10, Lisbon, Ohio 44432, Pro Se

## SUSAN RICHARD NELSON, United States District Judge

This matter is before the Court on remand from the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, *Brik v. United States*, No. 23-1898 (8th Cir. May 1, 2023) [Doc. No. 799], with instructions to determine whether Mr. Brik is entitled to a certificate of appealability.

In this Court's March 16, 2023 Order [Doc. No. 790], the Court considered Mr. Brik's Motion to Reconsider Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) [Doc. No. 773], and his Request for Leave to Relate Back to and/or Reopen His Initial § 2255 [Doc. No. 782]. The Court denied both motions as successive habeas petitions, filed without certification from the Eighth Circuit. (Mar. 16, 2023 Order at 1, 4–5.)

CASE 0:15-cr-00078-SRN-BRT Doc. 800 Filed 05/02/23 Page 2 of 2

On April 17, 2023, the Eighth Circuit denied Mr. Brik's motion for authorization to

file a successive § 2255 motion [Doc. No. 793], and issued its mandate [Doc. No. 794]. On

April 28, 2023, Mr. Brik filed a Notice of Appeal [Doc. No. 796] of this Court's March 16,

2023 Order.

In order to appeal an adverse decision on a § 2255 motion, a movant must first obtain

a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). A certificate of appealability

cannot be granted unless the petitioner "has made a substantial showing of the denial of a

constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This Court has considered whether the

issuance of a certificate is appropriate here and finds that the basis for dismissal set forth

in the March 16, 2023 Order—unauthorized successive habeas petitions—is not reasonably

debatable. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000).

Accordingly, because Mr. Brik has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a

constitutional right, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 2, 2023

s/Susan Richard Nelson SUSAN RICHARD NELSON

United States District Judge

2